

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 are pending. Claims 1-10 are rejected.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102/103:

Claims 1, 2, and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 4-46246 (hereinafter “JP246”).

Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the following:

(a) The rectangular support frame portion includes the first and second support frame member being opposed to the first and second supported sides of the mass member in the first direction, respectively.

(b) The rectangular support frame portion is closed in a circumferential direction thereof, while being open in its axial direction perpendicular to the first direction.

(c) At least one longitudinal elastic connecting member is disposed between the first support side of the support frame portion and the first supported side of the mass member, and is bonded by vulcanization at opposite end thereof to the first support side and the first supported side.

(d) At least one other longitudinal elastic connecting member is disposed between the second support side of the support frame portion and the second supported side of the mass member, and is bonded by vulcanization at opposite end thereof to the second support side and the second supported side.

(e) The support frame member is deformed so that the first and second support sides are relatively displaced toward each other in order to pre-compress the elastic connecting member previously bonded by vulcanization to the support frame portion and the mass member.

Claim 9 has been similarly amended. Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10 have been amended to maintain consistency with amendments to claims 1 and 9.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” (See MPEP 2131.) In addition, one criteria required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness is that “the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” (Please see MPEP 2143.)

The Applicant respectfully submits that JP246 does not describe or suggest all the claim limitations as recited in amended claims 1, 2, and 4-6.

Specifically, with respect to independent claim 1, JP246 does not describe or suggest at least the following limitations recited in amended claim 1: (b) said support frame member being closed in a circumferential direction thereof, while being open in an axial direction perpendicular to the first direction; (c) at least one longitudinal elastic connecting members being disposed in a space defined between the first support side of said support frame portion and the first supported side of said mass member, and being bonded by vulcanization at opposite ends thereof to the first support side and the first supported side; (d) at least another longitudinal elastic connecting member being disposed in a space defined between the second support side of said support frame portion and the second supported side of the mass member, and being bonded by vulcanization at opposite ends thereof to the second support side and the second supported side; and (e) said support frame portion is deformed after so that said first and second support sides are relatively displaced toward each other to pre-compress said elastic connecting members previously bonded by vulcanization at opposite ends thereof to the support frame portion and the mass member.

As indicated in the outstanding Office Action, in the device disclosed in JP246, the projections 5 are held in contact with inner surface of the metallic case 6, but are not bonded by vulcanization to the metallic case 6. That is, JP246 fails to teach the above features (c) and (d) recited in claim 1. Due to the lack of features (c) and (d), the case 6 should be closed all the direction in order to prevent dislodging of the mass member 3 from the metallic case 6. That is, JP246 fails to teach the above feature (b) recited in claim 1. Further JP246 fails to teach the above feature (e); namely, JP246 never teaches to deform the case 6 to compress the elastic connecting members that is previously bonded by vulcanization both to the case 6 and the mass member 3.

For the above reasons, amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from JP246.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103:

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP2824382 (hereinafter “JP382”) in view of Suzuki (JP02057475A, hereinafter “Suzuki”).

With respect to claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that JP382 and Suzuki, individually or in combination, do not teach at least the above-discussed limitations recited in claim 1. Specifically, as indicated in the outstanding Office Action, JP382 fails to teach the above features (b) and (e) recited in claim 1. Likewise, Suzuki fails to teach the above features (b), (d) and (e) recited in claim 1.

In Suzuki, the support frame portion is composed of a fixation plate 32 and the leg portions 34. The ends of the leg portions are not connected to each other. That is, Suzuki fails to teach the rectangular support frame portion is closed in a circumferential direction thereof, i.e., the above feature (b) recited in claim 1. Further, Suzuki fails to teach the above feature (d) recited in claim 1; namely, the mass member 41 is supported by only the first side of the frame via the elastic connecting member (see FIGS. 2, 6, 7 of Suzuki). In addition, Suzuki fails to teach the above feature (e) recited in claim 1. Since the mass member is supported by only the first side of the frame, even if the leg 33 is deformed, it is impossible to compress the elastic connecting member 43 (see FIG. 6 of Suzuki). Further, if the leg 33 is deformed as taught in Suzuki, the mass 41 will come into contact with another member, becoming immovable.

Because JP382 and Suzuki in combination fail to teach at least the above features (b) and (e) recited in amended claim 1, amended 1 is patentably distinct from JP382 and Suzuki. In addition, there is no reasonable expectation of success in the combination between the two references.

Similarly, amended independent claim 9 is patentably distinct from JP382 and Suzuki, because JP382 and Suzuki in combination fail to disclose at least the following limitations recited in claim 9: (b) said support frame member being closed in a circumferential direction thereof, while being open in an axial direction perpendicular to the first direction; and (e) deforming said support frame portion after said elastic connecting members being bonded by vulcanization to said support frame portion and the mass member so that said first and second support sides are relatively displaced toward each other to pre-compress said elastic connecting members.

Dependent claims 2-8 and 10 are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as those recited above for the independent claims 1 and 9, upon which they ultimately depend. These dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish these dependent claims from the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable over the prior art. The Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at telephone number (408) 255-8001.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Lee", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael Lee
Registration No. 31,846

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001